HUMAN EVENTS

Vol. XVI, No. 43 Wednesday, October 28, 1959 Washington, D. C.

THE LIBRARY
WISCONSIN STATE COLLEGE
RIVER FALLS, WISCONSIN

News Section

STRIKE: *Subverting the Taft-Hartley Act*.....(page 1)
ROCKEFELLER: *"Canned" spontaneity*.....(page 2)
EDUCATION: *Re-teaching the second R*.....(page 3)
MOVIES: *"Hidden persuaders" for the Reds*....(page 3)
SECURITY: *The value of secrecy*.....(page 4)

Steel Imbroglio: A determined and cleverly manipulated drive is well under way to gut the Taft-Hartley Act, which since 1947 has provided protection to rank and file union members and management alike. The labor bosses, working within the Administration and through the press, have laid the groundwork for this plan of destruction of the basic labor reform measure and apparently hope to exploit the steel situation between now and the first of the year when the Congress convenes. This picture—unconveyed in most of the press—shines crystal clear to all old hands on Capitol Hill.

Highlights of the "liberal" campaign are, as follows:

(1) Steel union boss McDonald's amazing rejection of the eminently reasonable compromise offered by the steel companies can only be interpreted as a deliberate trigger for industrial chaos. McDonald and his fellow bosses want a hectic and confusing industrial situation to create an atmosphere for scuttling of the Taft-Hartley Act. "It's outdated and must be replaced"—is the word passed out from union headquarters. Such noises, it is calculated, will greet Congress when it returns in January and will nourish legislation professedly aimed to "remedy" the chaotic situation in industry.

(2) Working closely with McDonald today and for a long time in the past has been Secretary of Labor Mitchell. This cabinet member has been working at odds with the White House. He is known to have opposed invocation of the Taft-Hartley Act in the steel conflict. The *Wall Street Journal* (October 21) reported that Mitchell, "acting on his own and without Administration sanction," is part of the movement to change the Taft-Hartley Act.

The Secretary of Labor, unable to dissuade Ike from invoking the Taft-Hartley Act, got in his licks when the "fact-finding board" was formed. Reportedly Ike, who is ignorant of personalities in the labor field, simply let Mitchell name the three members of the Board. The Chairman, Professor George Taylor, is well known as "Mitchell's favorite arbitrator and an anti-Taft-Hartley man." He wasted valuable time by attempts at mediation, only to have McDonald irresponsibly bring them to an abrupt end.

Steel management sources today recall the secret history of the wage settlement in 1956. They say that Mitchell warned the steel masters that, unless they came to terms with the union, the Administration was prepared to bypass the Taft-Hartley Act: the Administration would set up a "mediation" board headed by Milton Eisenhower, the President's "liberal" brother, to recommend a settlement. The steel management caved in and gave McDonald what he wanted. As a result, steel had to raise prices; inflationists rejoiced.

(3) Today and for the past two weeks, the "liberal" choir in the press has worked hard at its appointed mission to discredit the Taft-Hartley Act as "inadequate to deal with the present situation" and has distorted facts of history to support its thesis. One howler these pundits have propagated is that the late Senator Robert A. Taft backtracked on his original demand (incorporated in the Taft-Hartley Act) that a fact-finding board should not make recommendations for a strike settlement.

Taft never changed his mind about his original demand for no recommendations from such a board — according to two former aides who worked closely with Taft during those years.

True, Taft in 1949 proposed dropping this clause of the Taft-Hartley Act, but that was part of the great Senate strategist's effort to save most of the Act. For in 1949 Taft faced a difficult situation on Capitol Hill because Truman had won the 1948 election, with a promise to repeal the whole Taft-Hartley Act. In January, 1949, Truman's Democrats in Congress introduced bills to repeal the Taft-Hartley Act *in toto*. Taft filed a bill proposing a number of "sweeteners," dropping a number of Taft-Hartley provisions (including the prohibition of "recommendations") so as to rally as many votes as possible and to head off repeal of most of the Act. He won a test vote in the Senate, and then the labor boss lobby retreated and the legislation to repeal died in the House.

Not Merely Gossip: Former Utah Governor J. Bracken Lee captured more than half of all the votes cast as he outdistanced five other rivals last week in a preliminary nonpartisan election for the post of mayor of Salt Lake City. Lee will face State Senator Bruce Jenkins in a runoff slated for November 3.

● Ninety-five per cent of the Gary, Indiana, steelworkers were not in favor of the steel strike, said Bishop Andrew Grutka of the Gary diocese last week—according to *Our Sunday Visitor*, Catholic weekly with the largest circulation (900,000) among the Catholic press. This report confirms many similar observations in the press and contradicts the claim of Steelworkers boss McDonald that his members were completely behind the strike. It may bear fruit after the 80 days of cooling off.

● Senator Hubert Humphrey, hopeful for the Democratic Presidential nomination, last week received a 15-minute standing ovation from 2,800 United Auto Workers union delegates at the close of that body's Atlantic City

Published weekly at 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D. C. • Copyright 1959 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

meeting. According to the AP, delegates "banged on their tables, threw papers into the air, fired cap pistols and sang their union song." The demonstration for the Minnesota Senator far exceeded those given to Kennedy and Symington who had also appeared on the platform. Labor observers say the demonstration was undoubtedly organized by UAW leaders and it confirms the HUMAN EVENTS story last week that Walter Reuther, UAW head, plans to put over Humphrey as the Democratic nominee.

News From Dixie: The Nashville *Banner,* after the ovation given Senator Hubert Humphrey at the UAW convention:

"Most of the Southern Governors [in their recent conference] were of the opinion that a Dixie walkout is not likely to occur at the 1960 Democratic Convention.

"However, the Governors making this observation did not consider the remote possibility that Hubert Horatio Humphrey might be on the ticket in one spot or another.

"If this unlikely event did come to pass, there would be no walkout; instead Southern Democratic delegates would leave the convention hall on a dead run."

Rockefeller: Intelligence reaching Capitol Hill indicates that the Rockefeller drive for the GOP Presidential nomination, hitherto subterranean, will "surface" within the next two or three weeks. Workers in the New York Governor's vineyard are reported to be privately boasting that within that period the public will be amazed by the open and apparently "spontaneous" demand appearing in various parts of the country for Rocky's nomination.

A score of "Rockefeller for President" headquarters will appear in New England states during the next fortnight, it is said. Meanwhile, the intensive work done by Rockefeller agents in New Hampshire will step up. The Granite State is the "first inning" of the Presidential primary campaign. In 1952, Taft's loss of New Hampshire to Eisenhower dealt a heavy blow to his candidacy.

Additionally, according to what Capitol Hill learns, Rockefeller for President clubs will soon blossom in universities scattered all over the country. The preliminary organization of this "spontaneous" demand for Rocky by faculties and students has been accomplished by contacts between Rockefeller foundations and faculty members in the colleges which have benefited by these Rockefeller grants. The New York Governor's political agents are obtaining the names of students likely to establish Rocky Campus Clubs from the professors who have enjoyed Rockefeller foundation largesse.

There are also reports that many of the "public relations" personnel of the huge Standard Oil of New Jersey are busy phoning key people, spreading the Nelson gospel and lunching at clubs where key people gather. Standard of New Jersey is the mother home of the Rockefeller oil monopoly, which was finally dissolved (after years of court battles) by the US Supreme Court in 1911, in accordance with the Sherman Anti-Trust Law of 1890.

The Rockefeller money remained in Standard of New Jersey; other Standard Oil companies in various states passed into the hands of other owners and today are, in many cases, very much opposed to the nomination and election of Nelson Rockefeller. Meanwhile, banking and law firms controlled by the Rockefeller interests continue to pull strings in favor of the New York Governor (as reported in HUMAN EVENTS on September 23).

This unfolding picture confirms previous reports by HUMAN EVENTS and one "liberal" columnist, Ralph McGill, who wrote (September 12) about the Rockefeller political power via Rockefeller financed foundations. McGill remarked, "If the American people once sense that such a powerful, anonymous force is behind Governor Rockefeller, they may become suspicious of such bigness and of its power."

Steel Slowdown: The pouting laborites who boss the steel unions have no stomach for the 80-day Taft-Hartley back-to-work injunction.

Hints of a work slowdown are being dropped in labor circles. Should such a slowdown transpire on a wide basis, there will be little doubt that it was triggered by McDonald and his aides.

However, Washington notes: Any slowdown will come in the face of a recent National Labor Relations Board ruling that when employees engage in a slowdown, employers may reduce their pay in proportion to their reduced production, without violating the Taft-Hartley Act.

The ruling states that a slowdown is not protected, concerted activity under the Act and that an employer may discharge or discipline employees for slowing down.

A slowdown will make McDonald less popular not only with management, but with steelworkers' wives, who, after operating on tight budgets for months, are looking forward to full paychecks. Any McDonald-inspired slowdown would, in all likelihood, completely disenchant them with the white-haired, front-page glamor boy.

GOP Optimism: Republican Congressional Campaign Chairman Richard M. Simpson says that a firm anti-Socialist trend abroad and powerful GOP sentiment at home will make 1960 "the greatest Republican year in history."

Simpson, as he told an Illinois audience last week, justifies his optimism by pointing to three recent developments: (1) The upset victory by the GOP in Hawaii, (2) the overwhelming and unprecedented third straight Conservative party win in England, and (3) the GOP's gains in Connecticut's recent township balloting.

The Pennsylvanian says that the basic issues were the same in all three contests. "In Britain, the Conservative victory was a victory against economic experimentation—the same kind of dangerous fooling with the forces of supply and demand which the Democrats advocate for this country." Representative Simpson points out further that an increased number of workingmen supported both the British Conservatives and the Connecticut GOP. In the industrial town of Bristol, Connecticut—a Democratic stronghold—the GOP won for the first time in ten years.

● Congressman Simpson can now list another reason for his optimism. Attorney Howard W. Young, in his first fling at politics, scored a major victory for the Republicans in Massachusetts. Young, campaigning almost exclusively against the high-tax policies of Democratic Governor Foster Furcolo, won a special election two weeks ago

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in New Bedford for a vacant State Senate seat which had been Democratic since 1944.

In light of these wins, Republicans are now looking to next week's off-year elections. Many minor posts throughout the country will be filled, but virtually the lone important race will be the Kentucky governorship—where, surprisingly, the GOP scents a possible upset.

Republicans rarely win anything statewide in the Bluegrass State, but they found hope first in the Democratic primary fight in which "liberal" Bert Combs defeated a candidate backed by conservative Governor A. B. "Happy" Chandler. Then, too, GOP candidate John Robsion has been making the most of his chances—Robsion, a former US Representative whose House voting record became more conservative in recent years, has been out to woo the conservative Democrats who support Chandler; he has found a fertile issue in the threat of a new tax hike. At each campaign stop, Robsion calls on Combs to "say yes or no to whether he will approve a new tax increase when the Legislature meets in January." Combs' conflicting, evasive answers have so frightened Democratic bigwigs that they have called in Harry Truman to campaign for Combs, fearing defeat and patronage losses.

Education: When a university has to revise its program in order to teach undergraduates how to write and spell correctly, it casts a poor reflection on the efficiency of our public education system—but such is the case at Fairleigh Dickinson University in New Jersey.

Not one student in four among Fairleigh Dickinson's 13,000 undergraduates can spell the word "professor," according to a recent story in the New York *Herald Tribune*. Student compositions contain glaring errors in punctuation and sentence construction. Here are some examples furnished by the English department:

"I went to the game I saw the players." "We picked up our briefcases and carried it to the car." "We drove to the drugstore and eat a sandwich." "He stepped on the man below him's head." "I like to bowl and tennis." "We went to Madison; because we wanted to do some shopping."

Although students will no doubt continue to arrive at Fairleigh Dickinson ill-prepared to write and spell at the college level, the faculty has no intention of allowing them to be graduated before these shortcomings are overcome. Dr. Loyd Haberly, dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, reports a policy adopted for the first time this fall, whereby students must meet "college-level standards" in writing before they will be graduated. Every freshman, sophomore, junior or senior who fails to meet the minimum requirements will repeat the first semester of Freshman English.

Dr. Haberly explains: "There will be no exceptions, except for foreign students. Even they will be expected to comply after one year of special English classes. If seniors turn in bad papers, they're going right back to that freshman semester course. If they fail the freshman course, they will have to take a remedial writing course, for which there is no credit and for which they will have to pay $66."

Hollywood Mentality: Chief of the Motion Picture Association, Eric Johnston, who feels we can soften up the Communists by breaking bread with Messrs. Mikoyan and Khrushchev and who entertains the idea of extending trade credits to the Soviet Union, has come up with new suggestions on how to deal with the Communists.

Said the motion picture promoter: "Let the Russians see all the American movies they want—even 'The Grapes of Wrath' and 'Tobacco Road'—it's good propaganda for our own country."

The reason? When Russia exhibited a prewar newsreel showing Chicago cops clubbing strikers at a packing plant, the Russians, he says, didn't notice the clobbering, but rather the new shoes on the strikers. He was disappointed, Johnston said, when the State Department recently refused to distribute to the Russians a film on teenage violence, "Blackboard Jungle." They would have been impressed, Johnston felt, "by the fact that juvenile delinquents can afford wrist watches."

"How this can be good propaganda for our own country, I don't know," commented one Washingtonian, "but it's a darned good case for juvenile delinquency."

Book Event: The publication of *Out of the Jaws of Victory* (Henry Holt & Co., obtainable from HUMAN EVENTS at $4.95), by Jules Abels (author of *The Truman Scandals*), may well wield great influence in the nomination of the GOP candidate for the 1960 Presidential election—if the public and the politicos read it and draw the obvious lessons therefrom. For the book produces at least two inexorable conclusions which come as warnings to the GOP: (1) Me-tooism leads to defeat; (2) the governorship of New York is a poor training ground for winning a national election. Republicans who read this book may well shun "liberal" Nelson Rockefeller for the nomination next year.

Abels' task in his history of the extraordinary 1948 election is to explain how Governor Dewey of New York, as Republican Presidential candidate that year, snatched defeat "out of the jaws of victory." (The epigram is variously attributed to Democratic politico Paul Porter and Leonard Hall, Republican National Chairman under Eisenhower.) Opposed by three Democratic candidates (Truman, Thurmond and Wallace), Dewey—by his narrow stupid handling of the campaign—accomplished the miracle of losing, despite the fact that his opposition was split three ways and despite the fact that almost all observers believed he could not lose.

One vignette characterizes Dewey and his limitations: "Dewey was ill informed about national affairs at a time when they had become so complex that one needed to be a specialist in them. Dewey's background did not equip him with that knowledge. . . . He did not know national issues, except in a broad sense. It was to prove a fatal handicap in the campaign, particularly on the farm issue. He relied on Bell to fill the gap, but Bell himself had been immersed in state affairs for years." (Referring to Elliott Bell, Dewey's aide, on whom Abels places the major responsibility for most of the bad advice which Dewey accepted.)

Dewey, says Abels, "did not defend the 80th Congress (conservative and following Taft's lead) because he felt in his own heart that Truman was right, that it was a nest of reactionaries."

Another revealing picture: "Throughout the campaign Dewey never attacked the New Deal since the Bell strategy called for winning with Roosevelt votes."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Mystery of the Missiles Lag

By David S. Teeple

Mr. Teeple has held responsible, official jobs in the atomic energy program since 1943—always advocating a more stringent security policy and the development of nuclear propulsion.

THE ADVANCEMENT of the Soviet Union in science and technology constitutes a great peril to the United States and to the free world.

No single reason can explain why we lag behind the Communists in missile development. Lack of effort, poor organization and dissipation of our scientific personnel on nonessential programs have all contributed.

One aspect which is never mentioned, however, is that the Russians have discovered something which we have not; and thus far they have successfully *hidden* the *secret*.

The largest object which we have orbitted weighs but 13.4 pounds, compared to a Communist shot of 796 pounds. Obviously, the thrust of their rockets is far superior to anything we have attained—at least three times as powerful.

The jackpot question is: WHAT FUEL ARE THEY USING? Is it liquid, a solid, a boron, hydrazine, hydrogen, solid with an oxidizer, or organic or possibly nuclear?

If my eleven-year-old son could visit with a very communicative Soviet fuel expert and merely memorize the accurate name of the propellent, he could transmit to our scientists the greatest piece of information of the last decade. The single fact of knowing that a certain type of fuel would give such performance would be a major step toward its development.

If you think we are not hunting for this fuel, please recall that we just cancelled the boron project after expending $200 million without its ever going into production. (See the Washington *Post* of October 11.)

Now if what I have said is true, how do we justify the point of view of some of our scientists and politicians on the subject of science, secrecy and security?

Since the end of World War II, the American people have been bombarded with propaganda proclaiming the universal nature of science and deriding all people who favor security.

"Security through progress, and not through concealment" has been the motto. Disclosure and interchange of information have been the orders of the day!

A few quotations will recall the line of the organized pressure group composed of some of the leading scientists and supported by the entire "liberal" movement:

1. "Unfortunately, secrecy and progress are mutually incompatible. This is always true of science, whether for military purposes or otherwise. Science flourishes and scientists make progress in an atmosphere of free inquiry and free interchange of ideas, with the continual mutual stimulation of active minds working in the same or related fields. Any imposition of secrecy in science is like application of a brake to progress."—Dr. Karl T. Compton, 1949.

2. "The hope for science in this country and for the Nation's security is that the public at large will shed its fears, grow in understanding, and cease credulously accepting assertions that safety lies in secrecy. Secrecy is antithetical to the spirit of science. It is socially hurtful. Only for brief periods can it be practiced without destroying the scientific superiority it is intended to preserve . . ." —Prof. Walter Gellhorn, 1950.

3. ". . . Modern weapons are no longer secret in their entirety, and cannot be described on a few sheets of paper and locked in a safe. They are far too complex. It is equally true that the 'secret' of a modern weapon can seldom be disclosed by a stolen diagram. Rather, it requires the transmission of the basic principles of a large and complex technology, which in turn requires technically trained minds even to transmit the information." —Dr. M. Stanley Livingston, 1956.

On the other hand, some critics of the line have maintained that if we keep telling everything while the Russians tell nothing, sooner or later they would discover something that we would not.

Needless to say, people with this opinion were castigated unmercifully by the poisoned pens of the Drew Pearsons and the merciless sketches of the Herblocks.

Nevertheless, the day has arrived! The Communists have demonstrated that you CAN have scientific progress and do it in secrecy. Let some of our men of science who doubt this fact merely tell us what the Soviets are using in their rocketry.

LET SOME CONGRESSMAN like John E. Moss (D.-Calif.), who is always hunting headlines urging more disclosures, consult his sources and come up with the answer. Perhaps Pearson might write one of his famous letters to Khrushchev and ask for the recipe in the name of "all humanity."

One suspects Mr. K would merely smile and respond "Nyet," which might be a good thing for the American people to do the next time the "liberal" pressure groups advocate programs which threaten our national security.

CLERGYMEN APPRECIATE HUMAN EVENTS

M. P. BURTON, Grace Methodist Church, Austin, Texas: "I look forward to receiving HUMAN EVENTS each week. It helps me to better understand some of the live questions of the day."

REV. CARMELO DI SANO, Church of the Holy Redeemer Prince of Peace, Staten Island, N.Y.: "I am grateful for the good knowledge of HUMAN EVENTS."

REV. BEN A. MEGINNISS, Episcopal Church of the Nativity, Dothan, Ala.: "A very helpful publication. I like its brevity, its candor, its courage."

R. G. PATES, S. J., St. Francis Indian Mission, St. Francis, S.D.: "I find HUMAN EVENTS quite informative and sometimes inspiring."

REV. R. A. SCHINNERER, Holy Cross Lutheran Church, San Diego, Calif.: "HUMAN EVENTS has become a 'must' for me in the development of my personal information and insights for the role of Christian citizen."

RALPH E. SIMS, Montgomery Road Church of Christ, Cincinnati, Ohio: "The first thing I read in the mail! I frequently refer to it and recommend it to others."

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTIONS to HUMAN EVENTS for new subscribers only: 5 weeks $1. Yearly rate, $11; 6 months, $6; 3 months, $3.

By first class mail, $13 a year; by airmail (including APO and FPO) $15 a year. FOREIGN: $14 a year; airmail, Europe, Latin America, $21 a year; airmail, Asia, Africa and Pacific, $36 a year.

For change of address send old address (exactly as it appears on the envelope of your copy of HUMAN EVENTS) and new address (with zone number if any). **Allow us 2 weeks to process new subscriptions and changes of address.**

Bound Annual Volume with complete index, $15. Only 1955, 1956, 1957, and 1958 volumes available.

HUMAN EVENTS, 408 First St., SE, Washington 3, D. C., is a weekly Washington newsletter. Founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. Published usually in two sections: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article section. Second-class postage paid at Washington, D. C. Copyright 1959.

FRANK C. HANIGHEN, *Editor and Publisher* JAMES L. WICK, *Executive Publisher*
W. B. HICKS, JR., *Business Manager* FRANK CHODOROV, *Contributing Editor*
Assistant Editors: JOHN R. BENEDICT, NICHOLAS T. NONNENMACHER, GEORGE O. FOWLER

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Vol. XVI, No. 43 HUMAN EVENTS October 28, 1959

ARTICLE SECTION II

HISTORICAL SOCIETY LIBRARY MADISON, WISCONSIN

The Truth About Karl Marx

KARL MARX was a Jew and came from a family background that produced a long line of rabbis, some of them distinguished teachers in the fifteenth and eighteenth centuries. Yet religion played no part in the Marx family. His father, Hirschel, a well-to-do lawyer, was a free-thinker. For purely economic and social reasons Hirschel converted his entire family to Christianity; in the Germany of the early 19th century, higher professions were closed to Jews; but it could scarcely be said that he abjured Judaism, which he never professed, or that he embraced Christianity. To Karl, his Jewish origin was a matter of complete indifference. Some of his writings are packed with anti-Semitic references as, for example, his description of Ramsgate in August as being "full of fleas and Jews" and his reference in anger to Ferdinand Lassalle as a "Jewish nigger."

Hirschel Marx was disturbed by the arrogance, contemptuousness and selfishness which Karl began to show in college. In a letter to young Karl at the University of Bonn, Hirschel wrote:

> My heart often revels in thoughts about you and your future. And yet at times, I cannot free myself from gloomy, apprehensive, terrifying ideas, when like a lightning flash there breaks in the thought: Is your heart equal to your head, to your capacities? Has it room for these tender, earthly feelings which bring so much consolation in this vale of tears to the man of feeling . . . .

And later he wrote:

> Though I love you above everything (your mother excepted), I am not blind and still less do I mean to be blind. I make every possible allowance for you. But I cannot altogether throw off the idea that you are not free from egoism, more of it than is necessary for self-preservation. I cannot always drive away the reflection that in your place I should have treated my parents with greater consideration, with more unselfish love.

At the age of 25, Karl married Jenny von Westphalen, the granddaughter of a German nobleman. The marriage turned out to be cruel to Jenny.

In the early 1860's Marx wrote:

> My wife tells me every day that she wishes that she and the children were in the grave, and I cannot really blame her; for the humiliations, torments and abominations which we go through in our situation are simply indescribable.

In another letter, Marx wrote:

> My wife for the past year—it is understandable in the circumstances, but none the less disagreeable for that—quite lost her good humor, and plagues the children to death with her complaints and irritability and bad temper.

During some of their married life, Jenny had to work as a governess to support the family. When daughter Francesca died in 1852, the intercession of a neighbor prevented burial in a pauper's grave.

Ironically, Marx's mother, Henriette Marx reportedly said: "It would have been better if Karl had made some capital instead of writing about it."

For those who disagreed with his views, Marx had nothing but contempt. In his category of false friends were those who once believed in him and lost faith and those who, professing to be Socialists and revolutionaries, refused to adhere to his doctrine of revolutionary socialism.

Carl Schurz, the noted German-American political leader of the nineteenth century, wrote:

> I have never seen a man whose bearing was so provoking and intolerable. To no opinion which differed from his own did he accord the honour of even condescending consideration. Every one who contradicted him he treated with abject contempt; every argument that he did not like he answered either with biting scorn at the unfathomable ignorance that had prompted it, or with opprobrious aspersions upon the motives of him who had advanced it. I remember most distinctly the cutting disdain with which he pronounced the word "bourgeois;" and as a "bourgeois"—that is, as a detestable example of the deepest mental and moral degeneracy—he denounced everyone who dared to oppose his opinions.

Marx had no gift for friendship; he gloried in self-isolation. He only understood human feeling in so far as it related to him. Perhaps Marx was as near as any man could be an island unto himself.

The best friend Marx had was Frederick Engels, son of a German textile manufacturer, who supported him with periodic handouts.

The only tolerable relationship that anyone could have with Marx was one of subservience. Engels regarded himself sincerely as only a lieutenant. To Engels, Marx was "the greatest of living thinkers." "Marx was a genius," Engels said. "The rest of us were talented at best."

The literary collaboration between Marx and Engels was, of course, extensive. Engels had actually written some of the articles published in the *New York Tribune* under Marx's signature, and he undertook the tremendous task of organizing Marx's notes after his death and completing the final volumes of *Kapital.*

ONLY ON ONE OCCASION was there any serious difference between Marx and Engels. In January, 1863, Mary Burns, with whom Engels lived for 20 years, died suddenly of a heart attack. Engels announced the tragic news in a letter to Marx. In reply, Marx mentioned the death of Mary as if in passing and then went on to relate his own personal problems and, apparently, philosophic interests. This "frosty" letter unnerved Engels who answered:

> All of my friends . . . , including bourgeois acquaintances, have shown me on this occasion, which was bound to touch me very nearly, more friendship and sympathy than I could expect. You found the moment well chosen to advertise the superiority of your cold philosophy. So be it.

This article is an adaptation of a report of the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

Published weekly at 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D. C. • Copyright 1959 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In reply Marx made a shallow and uneasy apology.

Like his friend, Engels, Marx was a Socialist revolutionary and during his entire life was involved in some sort of radical or subversive activity. Accordingly, Marx had known arrest, imprisonment and exile. In Germany, Belgium, France, and England he actively participated in the establishment of an international Communist movement. He drafted the *Communist Manifesto* in 1848, the most important parts of which provided for: expropriation of land and property; a steeply graduated income tax; abolition of the right of inheritance; nationalization of credit; nationalization of transportation. He organized the First International and in 1870 supported the Paris Commune which ruled Paris for two months. A bellicose manifesto written by Marx entitled, "The Civil War in France," attacked the Thiers Government, the Parliament, and the French troops, and justified the shooting by the Commune of the Archbishop of Paris and 63 other hostages.

Marx's chief contribution to revolutionary activities was his work as a scholar and thinker. In October, 1833, he entered the University of Bonn to study law, but a year later transferred to the University of Berlin. In April, 1841, he received his Doctor of Philosophy degree from the University of Jena. During these early formative years Marx came under the spell of Hegelian philosophy which later influenced his thought. Important also was the impact of Ludwig Feuerbach, who preached a doctrine of materialism.

Marx was employed by the *New York Tribune* as its European correspondent for ten years. For each article, Marx received $5, later increased to $10. His relationship with the *Tribune* was terminated in the spring of 1862.

MARX'S GREAT CONTRIBUTION to political thought was, however, his monumental work, *Das Kapital*. To this task, Marx said he had "sacrificed my life, my happiness and my family." The first volume of his "damned book," as Marx often called it, was published in 1867. Work in the International diverted his energies, yet every year the pile of almost illegible notebooks increased. Marx died at 65 on March 14, 1883. The work of completing the second and third volumes of *Das Kapital* was left to Engels. The long period between the death of Marx and publication of the subsequent volumes indicates the extent of the confusion and disorganization of the manuscript material.

The development of Marx's ideas falls into three distinct stages: The philosophical influences are attributed to his last two years in Germany, 1842 and 1843; political influences came when Marx was in Paris in 1844, moving as he did from a world of philosophic abstraction to concrete political action; the economic interests were added after his meeting with Engels and his years of residence in England.

Ironically, Marx had no great affection for Russia, today the heartland of world communism. An inveterate anti-Slav complex lay deep within Marx's thinking, and for the Russians he, like Engels, had an instinctive aversion and distrust.

The doctrines of Marx made some headway among nineteenth century Socialists and revolutionaries, but it was upon the twentieth century that Marxism made its greatest impact. Marx claimed for his doctrine a universal validity for all future generations. Believing himself to be the prophet of the newly-created proletariat rising from the bowels of the industrial revolution, Marx proclaimed the coming of a new era. His analysis of the movement of human events and the forces of change led him to believe he had found the key to all history.

But Marx's doctrine spoke not of construction, but destruction. How the old order was to be cleared away offered no problem to him, but what was to take its place was an obscure vision, ill-defined and uncertain. Marx was above all a revolutionary. He cast the master plan for revolution, but his conception of the world that was to arise as a consequence was, as Carr observed, "conventional and even childish."

HERE LIES THE PARADOX of Karl Marx: He propagated class hatred in order to achieve the ultimate objective of social perfection and universal love. The immediate product of class hatred was to be the dictatorship of the proletariat. Marx denied the inherent rights of the individual; and the rights of human liberty he despised. His was a doctrine of mass rule, mass will, mass man, and mass society.

The doctrines of Marx in a variety of forms have had a vast influence in the world of today, but no state has come closer to the initial conceptions of Marx than the Soviet Union. The Soviets claim Marx, along with Lenin, to be their progenitors. They assert that the Soviet Union is on the way toward realizing the Communist millenium, a classless, perfect society. The Soviet State controls the means of production and distribution. Soviet society is a society of the mass man. Individualism is destroyed by the "dictatorship of the proletariat," and the human will is made subject to the all powerful state.

To some dozen people gathered at the Highgate Cemetery on March 17, 1883, paying their last respects to Marx, Engels declared:

"His name and his works will live on through the centuries." The supreme irony of the prediction lies today in the fact that the name and works of Marx have become the official dogma of the nation which Marx loathed with a deep and abiding contempt.

ORDER BLANK

HUMAN EVENTS, 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D. C.

Send me _____ reprints of "THE TRUTH ABOUT KARL MARX" at $ _____

[] Payment enclosed [] Bill me

Additional copies of this 2-page Article: single copy 15c (coins not stamps); 15 copies $1; 35 copies $2; 125 copies $5; 300 copies $10; 1,000 copies $20. In 5,000 lots $15 per thousand. Unless otherwise ordered, reprints are sent by fourth-class mail, which takes ten days to two weeks for delivery. For first-class mail delivery of 2-page articles, add ½c per copy; for airmail, add 1c per copy.

Enter my subscription [] 5 weeks for $1 [] 1 year for $11

Name _____

Street _____

City _____ Zone _____ State _____

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

has suddenly doubled! It comes out of the mill costing five cents. Not 2½. Still the mill is getting only a minute fraction of a penny for itself.

But the mill is required to pay . . . now the trail is getting warm . . . the mill has to add on seven Federal taxes and eight separate state taxes.

The railroad which hauls the finished flour . . . now the trail gets hot . . . keeps only a tiny fraction of a penny for its services, but adds on two pennies to pay five Federal taxes, plus state taxes, in every state through which the shipment passed. In this case there were three.

Jumping jehosephat! I thought taxes just soaked the rich! This is soaking anybody who buys a loaf of bread.

> And when I backtracked on those other ingredients, I found the sugar refiner paid eight Federal taxes and six Louisiana state taxes. The railroad that hauled the sugar paid taxes. The warehouse where the salt was stored in Chicago paid taxes. The shortening manufacturer and the yeast factory and the producer of the milk solids . . . each was keeping for himself such a minute profit that the total cost of the ingredients had added only two pennies. But the taxes had pyramided to more than twice that!

I am an amateur detective. But I did the best I could. And when I finally retraced the loaf of bread back to the grocer's shelf, I understood why that price tag is more than ten times what the wheat farmer gets. Because there are 151 separate taxes on that loaf of bread!

You and I have been complaining, however feebly, about the whack the income tax takes out of our weekly paycheck. But while we've been watching our wallet pocket, the hidden tax has been emptying our coin purse! And again and again and again. After all, we've consoled ourselves, the tax man gets only 20 per cent of my income. It's worth that to live in America.

BUT THAT'S A LIE and a delusion. The "tax man" has been picking your pocket for twelve cents every time you buy one loaf of bread. But with such clever sleight of hand and by such an involved and complicated multiplicity of hidden taxes his hand was quicker than our eye.

You think you pay a $100 tax when you buy a new $2,000 car. Listen: there have been $288 in hidden taxes collected on that car before it ever leaves the factory. And then there are all the taxes the dealer pays, taxes on income, property, taxes when you transfer the title, when you pay the state tax. So when you pay $2,000 for a car, more than one-fourth of that price is just taxes.

You've been figuring the corporation tax would cost only the big corporations. But look what happened. They added it to the price of the car. We pay it!

The grocer, the trucker, the baker, the miller—they don't pay their taxes. We do! When we buy that loaf of bread.

Railroads don't pay taxes. Corporations don't pay taxes. Just people pay taxes. All the rest of those fellows add their taxes onto the stuff they sell us. Only people pay taxes.

We hear that our Federal Government is sending a billion dollars to Tito. And we figure "so what . . . . " But every time our Government spends a billion, it taxes the average American family another $25.

Only people pay. How much different it might have been if our Government had said it the other way—that "every American family is asked to chip in $25 this year for Tito." Wow!

Conversely, every billion dollars which our Government saves (every billion dollars "less" that it spends) decreases the tax load for the American family of four by $25. Wow!

I'm going to remember that. Every time the Washington or state spenders speak of spending another billion for something or other, I'm going to remember it's 25 of my dollars they're spending. It'll make a difference.

YES, I FINALLY TRACKED DOWN the pickpocket. The middle man every farmer has wondered about. The guy who's behind the high prices every housewife complains about. I found him and his name is Sam.

But Uncle Sam is not alone. His accomplices are the tax laws of 50 states which add one-third to the price of one quart of milk. The farmer's truck and tractor are taxed. The deliveryman's truck and the tires on it and the battery in it. Even the air in the tires of that truck has four hidden taxes on it! I mean it.

The power to run the compressor motor is taxed, as are the oil for the compressor and the gas station attendant. There are sales taxes on the compressor motor and the rubber hose. There are four taxes on the air in the tires of the truck that hauls your milk.

When you get that explicit, counting the indirect as well as the direct taxes, there are more than one thousand taxes on one quart of milk. Taxes have crept up on us—like too many beers.

> Historically, whenever any nation has taxed its people more than 25 per cent of their income, that nation has been eating its seed corn—headed for economic decay. Already our taxes are devouring more than a third of every income dollar. They sought to slip the money painlessly from our paychecks by withholding it before we got it. But like an iceberg, the far greater hunk of our tax load is under the surface—out of sight.

Congress has been labeled a spending Congress. But if they spend more money, it will be your money. When they spend a billion for anything it will cost you $25. Both parties will try to buy your vote with your money. For the small wage earner, hidden taxes are far more costly than income taxes. The best kept secret in the United States today is the whole size of the tax load.

There are 150 taxes on one ladies' hat. Gasoline would sell for two cents a gallon—except for the tax.

I started out on the trail of a sneak thief and ended up with Public Enemy Number One. Now he's yours to prosecute as you see fit.

HUMAN EVENTS was founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. It is published weekly at 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D.C. and reports from Washington on politics, business, labor and taxes. It is usually published in two parts: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article. $11 per year.

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTIONS, new subscribers only: 5 weeks for $1.

ORDER BLANK

HUMAN EVENTS, 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D. C.

Send me ------ reprints of "PUBLIC ENEMY NUMBER ONE—TAXES"

at $ ----------

[] Payment enclosed [] Bill me

Additional copies of this 2-page Article: single copy 15c (coins not stamps); 15 copies $1; 35 copies $2; 125 copies $5; 300 copies $10; 1,000 copies $20. In 5,000 lots $15 per thousand. Unless otherwise ordered, reprints are sent by fourth-class mail, which takes ten days to two weeks for delivery. For first-class mail delivery of 2-page articles, add ½c per copy; for airmail, add 1c per copy.

Enter my subscription [] 5 weeks for $1 [] 1 year for $11

Name ----------

Street ----------

City ---------- Zone ------ State ----------

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Vol. XVI, No. 43 HUMAN EVENTS October 28, 1959

ARTICLE SECTION I

THE LIBRARY
WISCONSIN STATE COLLEGE
RIVER FALLS, WISCONSIN

Public Enemy Number One---Taxes

By PAUL HARVEY
News Commentator for the American Broadcasting Co.

I, PAUL HARVEY, started out chasing a sneak thief . . . and I ended up with the detection of Public Enemy Number One. I have been two weeks on the trail. I am very tired, but the job is done. No conviction yet, but I can name him now. And he is yours to prosecute as you see fit. Before I tell you his name . . . here's what happened:

Two weeks ago I got a letter from a farmer on the subject of the last election. But he included this question, "Who is the middle man who is getting rich off the farmer?"

He said he sells a bushel of wheat for $1.73. By the time that bushel of wheat is made into 66 loaves of bread it costs housewives $15.84. Whoa, there! "Who's getting rich on me?" the farmer wanted to know.

Well, I've heard that question repeated so often that I stopped listening to it. But suddenly I decided the one way to silence that noisome question—nobody had tried—was to answer it.

With my limited staff, we started playing detective. For the wheat in a loaf of bread the farmer gets 2½ cents. But you pay 24 cents. So you are both being robbed by somebody. Who?

I figured I'd backtrack on the culprit. So I went to the grocery store. "How much do you take out, Mr. Grocer, when you sell a loaf of bread?" I asked. "There's more than 20 cents missing that somebody's getting. Is it you?"

Well the grocer showed me that his markup is confined by competition to only three cents. In view of his salaries, overhead, that markup seemed fair enough, especially when he explained that he has to pay more than half of it back in corporate income taxes not covered in the sales tax. And also he contributes to the social security and unemployment taxes of his employees. He pays an electric bill every month, plus a tax on it. And his delivery truck was taxed when he bought it and the gasoline it uses and the license plates it wears are all taxed.

So all this overhead, not to mention his own income taxes, made three cents seem a fair enough "profit" for the grocer to make on that loaf of bread. Anyway, he was not the robber I was looking for.

I went to the wholesaler and rode on one of the trucks that delivers the bread. Maybe this driver was the boy who's been picking the farmer's pocket. But I divided the number of loaves of bread the man delivers by his wages per week and his take is less than 1/20 of one cent a loaf. So he's doing all right. But he's not stealing anything.

There's too much spread between the price and the cost of a loaf of bread. The guy I was looking for doesn't have just a finger in the kitty. He's in there with both fists.

I kept looking.

There were two tedious days of sleuthing for this sneak thief before I backtracked on that loaf of bread as far as the flour mill. But I made sure I didn't miss any possible middle men in the bakery or in the railroad that hauled the flour . . . or anywhere. And not one was getting away with anything. I mean the profit slice which each took for his services was an infinitesimal fraction of one-tenth of one penny per loaf. Not even measureable.

Then I got a tip. Check the sugar source. If nobody in the wheat-flour ingredient was robbing us—maybe the sugar people. I backtracked to a New Orleans refiner and it was another dead end. The price you pay for the sugar and the salt and the yeast and the milk solids and the shortening in the loaf of bread . . . all put together . . . comes to less than one-fourth of one cent per loaf.

So . . . and here is where I stubbed my toe. By the time I added everybody's profit for handling the materials and finished product plus the cost of the ingredients, I figured it all up and it came to 12 cents for a loaf of bread. You should be paying 12 cents for a loaf of bread.

But I can't get my grocer to sell me a loaf of bread for less than 24 cents. Who's doubling the price of my loaf of bread? Who's getting away with that other 12 cents? I had figured every handler's wage down to the most minute fraction. My figures could not be wrong.

A loaf of bread added up to 12 cents and it's still selling for 24 cents. I was getting as angry as the farmer who'd written me that letter. It's frustrating to have your wife go to the grocery store and—somewhere in there—get robbed by a ghost!

I went back to the farmer. I decided to start all over again, but working forward from the farmer. The research went faster this time because I knew the direction.

And this time I caught him. Red handed. The guy who's picked your pocket everytime you buy a loaf of bread. And he's been dealing himself in when you buy milk, too. There are 206 separate transactions involved in getting a quart of milk from the pasture to your doorstep. And sure enough, I found the same guy doubling the price.

THE SYNDICATE he operates is so smooth and so subtle that it's little wonder he's escaped the rap for this before. But I'm going to expose him, because he's gradually aiming to double the price of your loaf of bread again. And again.

While the farmer fusses and fumes and shadow boxes with imaginary villains, the real one has been hiding.

I took that farmer's bushel of wheat to the market. The farmer got $1.73 for it—2½ cents per loaf of bread. But when the flour mill added its fraction for milling . . . wait a minute . . . the flour to make one loaf of bread

Published weekly at 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D. C. • Copyright 1959 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED